

REMARKS

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Bardy (U.S. Patent No. 6,283,923). Claim 4 includes a limitation of “enabling the medical practitioner to execute secure access to a patient's database in a single sign-on action” through a secure website. The office action contends that Bardy discloses medical practitioner access to a secure website providing further access to a patient database. Moreover, the office action contends that mention in Bardy of an “email” confers disclosure of a single sign-on action.

Bardy discloses an internet connection providing a path for communication and delivery of collected patient data to a server, which in turn forwards the delivered, collected patient data to a database in an automated data collection scheme. Col. 7, line 8-17. The collected patient data, after delivery, is analyzed and a patient status indicator is given as to the medical well being of the patient. Feedback is given to the patient via email. However, in the event of a potential medical concern, notification is given to medical practitioners using the same feedback module as used to provide feedback to the patient. That is, an email (or fax or automated telephone voice message) is sent. See, e.g., col. 15, lines 48-51. Bardy does not, however, disclose that the medical practitioner is able to execute secure access to a patient's database in a single sign-on action through a web-based site having secure sign-in access to the patient's database in accordance with a prescribed protocol. Instead, Bardy shows a system arrangement in Fig. 2 wherein work stations (36) are connected to an intranetnetwork (33) and not the internetwork (15). It is from these workstations that medical personnel access the patient database. See col. 8, lines 27-32. Thus, there is no secure website through which a medical practitioner gains access to patient data in the database.

Accordingly, Bardy fails to anticipate claim 4.

Claims 5-10 were rejected as being obvious from Bardy in view of de la Huerga et al. (US 5,903,889). Claim 8 was separately rejected as being obvious from Bardy and de la Huerga in further view of Barry et al. (US 6,081,786). In each rejection, the basic premise is that Bardy anticipates claim 4. As shown above, Bardy does not anticipate

claim 4. Accordingly, each of the obviousness rejections, wherein Bardy is the primary reference and is relied upon as anticipating claim 4, also fails and should be withdrawn.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 19, 2007

/Daniel G. Chapik/
Daniel G. Chapik
Reg. 43,424
Telephone: (763) 514-3066
Customer No. 27581